

THE ARMY ROTC INSTRUCTOR AT
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

LAWRENCE K. RATY

THE ARMY ROTC INSTRUCTOR
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

by

Lawrence K. Raty

Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Supervisory Committee

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the
University of Utah in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Educational Administration

University of Utah

June 1970

APPRECIATION

This Thesis for the Master of Arts Degree

by

Lawrence K. Raty

has been approved

May 1970

[Redacted Signature]

Chairman, Supervisory Committee

[Redacted Signature]

Supervisory Committee

[Redacted Signature]

Supervisory Committee

I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge the assistance

I have received from [Redacted Signature]

Chairman, Major Department

initial inspiration for this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to [Redacted Signature]

Dean, Graduate School

their course instruction and advice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. E. T. Demars, my committee chairman, who has been most helpful in providing the guidance and assistance necessary to enable this study to be completed. For this he shall be appreciated and remembered as both a teacher and a personal friend.

To the Professor of Military Science, LTC Oscar R. Frandsen, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks for his thoughtful understanding and support during the preparation of this study. Included in my acknowledgment must be the other members of the Cadre of the Military Science Department, Major Robert H. Grassi, Captain Jon D. Collins, and Captain Eric A. Perry whose help was essential to the compilation of the statistics concerning the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps at the University of Utah.

I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge the assistance I have received from Mr. John S. Harris, Assistant Professor of English at Brigham Young University, who provided the initial inspiration for this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to the A. S. U. U. Course Evaluation Committee for their assistance in making available their course evaluation materials.

Especial appreciation is expressed to Mr. Bob Ingebretsen for his personal help in obtaining the results of past course evaluations and the assistance he has rendered in interpreting the results thereof.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
The Problem	2
Delimitations	3
Definitions	3
Methods	4
Related Studies	5
Justification	7
Organization.	9
II. THE AROTC INSTRUCTOR.	11
Selection Procedures.	11
Instructor Preparation.	15
Summary	24
III. STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS.	26
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	27
A. S. U. U. Opinion Poll.	34
Ad Hoc Committee Report - ROTC at the University of Utah.	37
Summary	39

IV. THE "IDEAL" INSTRUCTOR	43
Development of the criteria.	45
The Questionnaire.	47
Method	47
Summary.	51
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . .	53
Summary.	53
Conclusions.	54
Recommendations.	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	58
APPENDICES.	pp. 60 - 87
VITA.	88

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLES	PAGE
1. ROTC ASSIGNMENT PREREQUISITES.	14
2. RECOMMENDED INSTRUCTOR TRAINING SCHEDULE..	16
10. STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE ASUU OPINION POLL, AUTUMN 1969.	35
11. ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE	39
12. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AROTC STUDENTS.	49

FIGURES

1. STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE - 1967 - 68.	28
2. COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE 1969-1970.	29
3. SAMPLE OF THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE. . .	31
4. COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS, WINTER QUARTER 1967 - 1968.	32
5. COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS, AUTUMN QUARTER 1968 - 1969.	33
6. COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS, WINTER QUARTER 1968 - 1969.	33
7. COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS, AUTUMN QUARTER 1969 - 1970.	34

ABSTRACT

Recent controversy on the nation's college campuses has focused the attention of the American people on the Reserve Officers Training Program and the role it plays in providing commissioned officers for the armed forces of the United States.

Caught up in the midst of this controversy is the AROTC Instructor whose presence on the University campus is not only being questioned, but also the position he occupies and the recognition he receives.

It was the purpose of this study to examine the AROTC Instructor at the University of Utah, his selection and assignment to the faculty, and the response of the students at the University to the instruction which they received.

A review of both official military publications and unofficial sources provided the information concerning the selection and assignment of Army officers as instructors in the AROTC program. Student response was measured by extracting the results of student course evaluations, student opinion polls, and official University studies as they related to this study. Additional information concern-

ing the instructor traits of the AROTC instructors was obtained by evaluating them on the basis of a list of traits developed to form an image for the "Ideal" instructor.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicated that the AROTC instructor, with a sound background of experience, is well qualified to serve on the faculty of this University. It also showed that based on student evaluations, his performance as an instructor compared very favorably with that of the average for all instructors at this institution. In addition, a comparison of the AROTC instructor with the characteristics of the "Ideal" instructor would indicate that here too he is ranked by the students above the average of his contemporaries. It may be concluded therefore, that the reasons for these findings are to be found, not just in the academic qualifications of the AROTC instructor, but also as a direct result of the training and educational experiences he has received in the Army along with the dedication and genuine concern he has for the training and development of his students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the efforts of the AROTC instructor no longer be frustrated with distorted objections and misunderstandings but rather be recognized as an important, vital part of the education and training necessary in the preparation of our young men to occupy positions of authority and leadership in the Army of the United States.

It is further recommended that continued efforts be made to coordinate the work of the AROTC instructor with that of other instructors at the University in fields related to the AROTC program to further enhance the education and training of the AROTC student.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The recent controversy on the nation's campuses concerning the ROTC program has focused the attention of the people of this country on the major source of reserve officers for our armed forces. The ROTC program alone has the task of producing at least 15,000 officers each year in order to meet the needs of an Army which requires personnel trained in a wide variety of fields. Currently, there are 274 colleges and universities which offer Army Reserve Officer Training, with approximately 20,000 students registered in the AROTC program. In 1969, there were 16,000 officers commissioned through the AROTC program alone. This represents a production of junior officers which is approximately 20% greater than that produced by West Point for a similar period.

Included in this controversy is the question of the competency of the ROTC instructor to teach on the university level. Closely allied with this is the question of whether or not academic credit should be given for ROTC instruction.

It was the purpose of this study to examine the first of these questions, both from the point of view of academic qualification as well as in the opinion of the student, who, perhaps, is best qualified to evaluate the effect of the instruction he has received.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. It was the purpose of this study to examine the AROTC instructor at the University of Utah to determine what factors are considered in his selection and assignment to a position at the University, and what the response has been to his instruction by the students within the AROTC program.

Specific Objectives. The specific objectives of this study were: (1) to review the factors concerning the selection and assignment of officers to the staff of the Army ROTC; (2) to examine the results of student course evaluations and student opinion polls to determine the attitude of the students concerning the effectiveness of the AROTC instructors; (3) to determine the response of the AROTC students to a questionnaire concerning the characteristics of the AROTC instructor compared with those of the "Ideal" instructor.

II. DELIMITATIONS

This study deals primarily with the results of student opinions as expressed at the University of Utah towards the ROTC program in general and, in specific, the AROTC program. The results and conclusions should be interpreted only in light of the specific information found in the student course evaluations and the student opinion polls which were used in formulating this study. The opinions expressed are those of the author and in no way should be interpreted to be an expression of official opinion either for the University of Utah or the United States Army.

III. DEFINITIONS

AROTC. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps program which is conducted by the United States Army.

AROTC Cadet. is used to identify a student in the Army Reserve Officer Training Program.

Military Science. The name assigned to the AROTC Department at the University of Utah.

ROTC. Reserve Officers' Training Corps. ROTC as used in this study is a term which includes in its definition all of the programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

IV. METHODS

The information concerning the selection of AROTC instructors was compiled using historical methods. This technique was also used in reviewing the results of the student opinion polls and the student course evaluations. Information for this portion of the study was compiled from the student course evaluations published by the Student Course Evaluation Committee, Associated Students of the University of Utah, from the results of a student opinion poll sent to all prospective students at the University along with their registration materials for registration for the Autumn Quarter, 1969, and from the report of the AD HOC Committee appointed to study the ROTC program at the University of Utah.

Survey techniques were used in obtaining the responses of AROTC Cadets to a questionnaire concerning the "Ideal" instructor. The questionnaire was developed from materials obtained from the English Department of the Brigham Young University.

V. RELATED STUDIES

In 1958, Kenneth F. Cravens made a study of the ROTC programs at the University of Utah entitled, "ROTC at the University of Utah."¹ This in-depth study considered many facets of the ROTC program. The ROTC student was asked to respond to a questionnaire concerning his experience with the ROTC and compare it with other aspects of the educational offerings at the University. Portions of his study dealt with the effectiveness of the instruction received through the ROTC departments. A comparison of the responses to his questionnaire revealed that the ROTC cadets felt that the instruction they received was "above average", and, Mr. Cravens concludes, "All groups rated the instruction in their own department as being significantly above the scale mean of 3.0. The Army rating of 3.83 was the highest...".

The Air Force ROTC was the subject of a study conducted at the Colgate University in 1953.² In an article appearing in the Association of American Colleges Bulletin in

¹Kenneth Francis Cravens, "ROTC at the University of Utah", (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Utah, 1958.)

²The ROTC Study Committee of Colgate University, "The Impact of an ROTC Program on a Liberal Arts College: A case Study of Colgate University", Hamilton, New York, 1953.

December, 1952,³ Mr. S. J. French reported that the study was near completion and that areas of specific interest were receiving the attention that they require to produce a comprehensive report which would identify the position of the ROTC with respect to a Liberal Arts College.

This report, cited in Mr. Cravens' thesis, in part relates to the present study, in particular that portion of the findings which refers to the status of the instruction.

Not all of the ROTC work seems yet to be strictly of college caliber, and the text materials are not of uniformly high standard.... The teaching of ROTC subjects, is perforce, done by many people with less pedagogical training and experience than is usually required for college teachers.

In June, 1969, the members of the Officer Education Advisory Committee at the University of Washington were asked to conduct a study of the ROTC program at that institution. Their comprehensive study,⁴ while not making specific recommendations, did ascertain the status of the program at that University in light of the requirements for academic excellence. Their study reviewed the history of

³Sidney J. French, "Impact of the Air Force ROTC Program on a Liberal Arts College", Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 38:532 Dec., 1952, pp. 532-3.

⁴The Officer Education Advisory Committee, "Factual Analysis of Matters Relating to the ROTC Program at the University of Washington", Seattle, Washington, 1969, pp. 29-34.

the ROTC program at that University, the contractual agreements made by the University with the military services, and the obligations of the University under their formal relationships.

It was concluded by the committee, among other things, that the staff of the ROTC program at the University of Washington was "professionally competent and fully qualified for its respective faculty ranks under prevailing criteria for appointment. Furthermore, the academic criteria for the ROTC faculty appointments are not inconsistent with those for many other departments within the University."⁵

VI. JUSTIFICATION

Since the inception of the ROTC program at the University of Utah in 1919, many changes have been recorded. Some of these have been due to changes in the requirements by the military services in accordance with the needs of the country. With the advent of the Second World War, for example, the number of young men in the ROTC program was twice that maintained during the pre-war years. Once the war was over, the requirement for trained officers decreased and the ROTC experienced a corresponding decrease in enroll-

⁵Ibid. p. 34.

ment. Enrollment followed the same pattern at the time of the Korean conflict. Other factors, in addition to the requirements of the military, effect student enrollment in the program. Currently, it is the public acceptance and support which are the two major factors that influence the ROTC program. At this moment we are in the midst of an unpopular war in Viet Nam. The people of this country are faced with the heavy burden of continuing to support a conflict with money and what is more important, the lives of our young men. As of May, 1970, this commitment has cost the American taxpayer vast amounts of money and has been responsible for the loss of over 40,000 of our young men.

The resulting resentment has caused many people in this country to find fault with the United States Government. Many of the programs of the government have come under the close scrutiny of the people. Personal experience with some aspect of the government, as it touches the individual's life such as taxation or the "draft", has brought the organization, operation and efficiency of government programs to their immediate attention.

Unfortunately, there are those elements in our society who wait for an opportunity to seize upon some one topic which has incurred the displeasure of the American people

to use it as a vehicle to further their own ends. Such has been the case with the ROTC program. In many colleges and universities throughout the country, where ROTC is taught, dissident student groups have agitated to have the ROTC program removed from the campus. One of the issues which they have created concerns the status of the ROTC instructor. They contend that neither do they belong in an academic atmosphere where freedom of political expression and freedom of thought are found, nor are they qualified to serve on the faculty of a university.

It was the purpose of this study to determine if these contentions have any basis in fact and to examine the AROTC instructor specifically to ascertain what his particular qualifications are and what the results of his instruction have been at the University of Utah. It is hoped that the results of this study may assist in resolving future questions concerning the AROTC instructor and provide a source of reference for further studies concerning the ROTC program.

VII. ORGANIZATION

The study on the Army ROTC Instructor has been organized to present both a factual consideration of the opinions of the students in the AROTC program, as expressed in the

student course evaluations, as well as a hypothetical evaluation in which the AROTC instructor is compared with an "Ideal Instructor" image. To accomplish this, the remainder of the study has been organized as follows:

Chapter II. "The Army ROTC Instructor."

Chapter III. "Student Evaluation."

Chapter IV. "The 'Ideal' Instructor."

Chapter V. "Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations."

CHAPTER II

THE ARMY ROTC INSTRUCTOR

I. SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR ARMY ROTC INSTRUCTORS.

The selection procedures used to obtain instructors for the AROTC program have been established at the Department of the Army and are utilized by the Office of the Officer Personnel Directorate in selecting those officers qualified to serve in that program.⁶

The Major Commands Branch. The Major Commands Branch deals with officers in the grade of First Lieutenant to Lieutenant Colonel. The Colonels Division of the Officer Personnel Directorate (OPD) is responsible for the selection and assignment of Colonels to serve as Professors of Military Science.⁷

The programmed requisitioning cycle begins with the formulation of the list of all officers on ROTC duty by the Major Commands Branch. On the first of September this

⁶Headquarters Department of the Army, Army Regulation No. 611-50, Assignment to Reserve Component and Reserve Officer Training Corps Duty, (Washington, D. C.; Government Printing Office, 1964).

⁷Headquarters United States Army Command, "7th Annual ROTC Conference," Fort Monroe, Virginia, 1969, pp. 30-33.

roster is sent to the career branches (Infantry, Armor, etc.) to have the projected reassignment date for each officer annotated. At the same time coordination is established with the Enlisted Personnel Directorate (EPD) to compare projected reassignments of officers with senior enlisted men. If the personnel turnover is excessive, the negotiations are conducted with the career branches and EPD. When the evaluations and the screening is over, the adjusted roster is sent to the United States Continental Army Command (USCONARC) and serves as the basis for the annual requisitioning for ROTC. On the first of February the requisitions are due at the Department of the Army. The requisitions are validated by the Major Commands Branch and forwarded to the appropriate career branches for action. The branches, monitored by the Major Commands Branch, forward nominations for the ROTC positions to the Continental United States (CONUS) Armies and the schools for approval. Acceptances are normally confirmed to the Major Commands Branch from the CONUS Armies. The appropriate career branch is notified and assignment instructions are issued. To the maximum extent possible, an attempt is made to have the replacements arrive at the schools between June and August.

Policies. It is the goal of the OPD to provide officers to fill 100 percent of the authorized positions. Achieving this goal is made difficult by the competitive demand for top quality officers from the Department of the Army, joint staff activities, and military commitments. The annual requisitioning cycle provides a measure of control, in terms of time, for assignments and reassignments, and limits the number of officers who must be moved during the course of the school year to an acceptable level. Policy dictates that assignments to and from ROTC duty will be programed for the end of the school year (June through August) and that the annual instructor turnover at any given institution will not exceed 50 percent.

A great deal of time is spent in reviewing the individual records of officers and analyzing their professional qualifications before a man is nominated for ROTC duty. The receiving institution has the prerogative to accept or to decline a nomination by the Department of the Army. It should be noted, that while there is a great deal of emphasis placed on the individuals academic qualifications, the most important consideration is--and will continue to be --his military training, experience, and demonstrated

performance.⁸ The following table presents a graphic representation of the qualifications necessary for assignment to the ROTC program.

TABLE 1
ROTC ASSIGNMENT PREREQUISITES

Prerequisite	PMS	Asst. FMS
Appropriate Grade	X	X
Career Course Graduate		X
CGSC Graduate (Command and General Staff College)	X	*
College Graduate	X	X
Advanced Degree	X	
Able to perform effectively in an academic environment	X	X
Minimum of 4 years on active duty plus background and experience	X	X
Demonstrated above average performance	X	X
Sufficient time remaining to complete a two year tour	X	X
X = mandatory		
* = desirable		

As may be seen from the foregoing table, each officer appointed to the ROTC must be at least a college graduate. In the case of the Professors of Military Science (PMS), as of June, 1969, all such positions have been validated as advanced degree positions by the Department of the Army.

⁸ Ibid.

II. INSTRUCTOR PREPARATION

"The success of the Army depends on the effectiveness of the instruction that individuals and units receive during training."⁹

This statement, taken from the text used by the Army in training its instructors, indicates the importance placed by the Army on instruction. In each of the service schools the program of instruction for both the Basic as well as the Advanced course calls for a thorough consideration of the techniques of military instruction that contribute to successful teaching. All officers and non-commissioned officers must know how to teach. As specialists in some phase of the military profession, they may possess an excellent knowledge of their particular field; but, to teach others they must also know the best methods and procedures for imparting that knowledge.

The training that they receive is divided into the following general areas:

Discussion of the instructor's role in training.

Principles of instruction.

Presentation of oral instruction.

⁹U. S. Department of the Army, FM 21-6, Techniques of Military Instruction, (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 3.

Speech Techniques.

Preparation and use of Training Aids.

Preparation for Instruction.

Practical Application.

As indicated in the following table, this training is comprehensive and oriented towards developing an awareness on the part of the instructor both of the requirement to be well prepared in his subject area as well as in the theory and use of proper teaching principles and techniques.

TABLE 2

RECOMMENDED INSTRUCTOR TRAINING SCHEDULE

SUBJECT	HOURS	SCOPE
The Army Instructor	2 hrs.	To provide a general knowledge of the purpose and conduct of the course and facilities available. Discussion of the instructor's role in training, his qualifications, how he can improve, and how he should think of and deal with students.
Principles of Instruction	1 hr.	To provide a general knowledge of the teaching-learning process, including the nature of learning, the instructional process, and the principles of instruction.

TABLE 2 - continued.

SUBJECT	HOURS	SCOPE
Presenting Oral Instruction	2 hrs.	To provide a general knowledge of the elements of oral instruction that are common to the presentation of instruction. Explanation will include how to present lesson objectives; how to handle problems of organization, transition, interest, and emphasis; and how to summarize.
Speech Techniques	1 hr.	To provide a general knowledge of effective speech techniques. How to maintain contact and good bearing; how to use notes; importance of avoiding distracting mannerisms; how to control nervousness and develop enthusiasm; and the importance of developing vocal variety, force, and distinctness.
Preparation for Student Lessons	2 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of how to prepare an introduction. Students will make individual preparation under the guidance of instructors. Preparation should include rehearsals.
Introductions	3 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of how to present effective introductions. Each student will plan and present a 3-5 minute introduction included in the instructional program of the unit to which he is assigned. The techniques previously presented will be critiqued.

TABLE 2 - continued.

SUBJECT	HOURS	SCOPE
Training Aids	2 hrs.	To provide a general working knowledge of the types of training aids used in the Army, and the local procurement and techniques of using them. Explanation and demonstrations will include how to use the chalkboard, the overhead projector, charts, and actual items of equipment. Materials and equipment provided locally for making aids will also be explained and demonstrated.
Demonstration Method	1 hr.	To provide a general knowledge of the types of demonstrations and their use in military instruction. Explanation will include factors to consider in planning a demonstration and techniques for the conducting of demonstrations.
Questioning Techniques	1 hr.	To provide a general knowledge of the use of questions in instruction, including characteristics of a good question, techniques of asking questions, and the handling of student answers.
Preparation for Student Lessons	3 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of how to prepare an explanation, using the chalkboard. Students will make individual preparation under the guidance of instructors. Preparation should include rehearsal.

TABLE 2 - continued.

SUBJECT	HOURS	SCOPE
Chalkboard Presentations	6 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of the use of the chalkboard during oral presentation. Each student will plan and present a 10-minute lesson. Each student will be critiqued. The class will be divided into sections.
Application	2 hrs.	To provide a general knowledge of the methods and techniques employed in conducting applicatory training. Explanation will emphasize the progressive nature of applicatory methods. A demonstration lesson employing the group performance method will be presented.
Evaluation	2 hrs.	To provide a general knowledge of the role of evaluation in the instructional process, including forms of tests, with emphasis on the performance test, observation techniques, and the procedures for administering tests.
Planning the Lesson	4 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of how to prepare a unit of instruction for teaching. Explanation will include use and study of approved lesson materials, how to develop instructor notes, requirements for and techniques of rehearsing, and how to write a simple lesson plan. Practical work will consist of students writing their lesson plans for short lesson presentations.

TABLE 2 - continued.

SUBJECT	HOURS	SCOPE
Short Lesson Presentations	8 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of the methods and techniques for presenting a conference unit of instruction. Each student will plan and present a 15 minute lesson applicable to the training program of the unit to which assigned, in which he will apply techniques so far presented in the course. A lesson plan will be submitted for grading. Presentations will be supported by student made training aids. Presentations will be critiqued by members of the class and the instructor.
Preparation for Student Lessons	12 hrs.	To provide a working knowledge of how to prepare a unit of instruction in which the complete instructional process of presentation-application-evaluation is used. Students will make individual preparation under the guidance of the instructors. Preparation will include writing a lesson plan and rehearsing.
Long Lesson Presentation	16 hrs.	To qualify each student to prepare and present a complete unit of instruction. Students will be required to teach unit of instruction from their training schedule, in the classroom or area normally scheduled for such training, when possible. Presentations will be 35 minutes long. A lesson plan will be presented for grading. Each presentation will be critiqued by the students and the instructor.

TABLE 2 - continued.

SUBJECT	HOURS	SCOPE
Final Examination and Critique	2 hrs.	Each student will take a 50 minute examination that will test his understanding of the material taught in the course. A critique of the examination will be conducted during the second hour.

As this table has indicated, the program followed by the Army in instructor training is a comprehensive one which introduces the prospective instructor to the various facets of the educational process. Not only does he receive instruction in the theory of the methods of instruction, but also practical work which is observed, evaluated and critiqued.

Superior instruction comes about, not by accident, but as the result of having well trained instructors, instructors who know their subjects thoroughly and know how to present them to others.¹⁰

One of the first things that instructor trainees are taught is what constitutes a good instructor. Those characteristics which the instructor should possess are:

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 4.

Knowledge of the Subject.

Knowledge of the Teaching Techniques.

Positive Personality Characteristics.

To be able to adopt and make use of these characteristics presupposes that the individual has received instruction concerning them. It has been one of the purposes of this study to indicate how and to what extent the AROTC instructor has had training in this area. This training, if it has been effective, will be reflected in the subjective evaluations of the students taught by the instructors in the AROTC program. As discussed previously, the characteristics of professionalism and leadership ability are prerequisite for selection for assignment to the AROTC program and because of this will not be discussed here. It must be realized, however, that these two factors play an important part in the presentation of the subject matter presented by the AROTC department.

In addition to the initial training that the instructors receive, they are given a refresher course prior to commencing with their duties in the AROTC program. (See Appendix 2 for an example of the training schedule for the AROTC Instructor's Orientation Course conducted at Fort Lewis,

Washington in 1968.) The orientation course may be divided into four general categories:

Procedures and Duties of Personnel in the ROTC program.

The ROTC Curriculum.

Methods of Instruction.

Guest Speakers from Universities Represented at the Camp.

A Major portion of the course is devoted to the methods of instruction, which includes lesson presentations by participants in the course. The importance of the AROTC program is particularly stressed, with special emphasis on the need to provide junior officers to meet the requirements of the Army. These requirements indicate that the AROTC program has been designed to produce officers for the reserve program, as well as for the regular Army. At the time this study was written, there were approximately 165 Army general officers on active duty who received their commissions through the AROTC program. This gives some indication of the value of the training received through this program. The AROTC has the primary mission of producing young officers who have the potential of advancing to positions of greater responsibility. To accomplish this, those

officers called to serve as instructors in the program have to provide the quality of instruction which will not only serve to train the men in their charge in specific skills, but at the same time present them with a challenging, inspiring educational program which will further their development and usefulness both as commissioned officers as well as effective citizens. The quality of the future officers in the Army is determined primarily by the AROTC instructors at the universities of our country.

III. SUMMARY

The selection of instructors for the AROTC program is at best, a difficult task. It is made more difficult by the competitive demands for top quality officers from the Department of the Army, joint staff activities and current tactical requirements. In spite of this, officers assigned to the AROTC program must have the necessary qualifications to be able to function in their capacity as instructors as well as to fit into the academic environment of the university. In this last category, due to the increased attention focused on the ROTC program, more and more emphasis is being placed on the academic qualifications of the officer assigned to AROTC duty.

It has been the intent of this portion of this study to identify those qualities which are considered by the Department of the Army in selecting officers for the program as well as to give some insight into the program. It will be the purpose of the subsequent chapters in this study to examine the results of this training when compared with the results of the instruction provided by the other members of the University teaching staff.

CHAPTER III

STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS

In 1967, in response to the expressed desires of many members of the University student body, a trial course evaluation system was introduced at the University of Utah. Due to the positive initial response to that trial system, an expanded course evaluation program was developed which encompassed all classes at the University. This program has provided a ready made means of comparing the AROTC instructor with his contemporaries in an effort to determine the validity of his assignment to the faculty through the response to his instruction he has received from the students in his classes.

The first book on Faculty-Course Evaluations was published in 1968, with the results of evaluations made on classes conducted during the Winter Quarter, 1967-68.¹¹ This study contained evaluations of 601 classes out of approximately 2,000 classes of which, 1,400 are considered to be "major" classes. This system incorporated the use of a computerized questionnaire which was developed through the

¹¹A.S.U.U. Course Evaluation Committee, U. of U. Course Evaluation, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, 1968).

combined efforts of both students and faculty. In each case in which the class was published, at least 81% of the enrolled students returned the questionnaire.

Since that time, there have been three other publications. These have considered the course evaluations made during the Autumn Quarter 1968-69, Winter Quarter 1968-69, and the Autumn Quarter 1969-70. The primary reason that these evaluations have not been conducted for each quarter is that they are completely financed by student funds. These funds do not provide sufficient money to publish a course evaluation each quarter.

I. STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

A short questionnaire which would fit an IBM card was developed in 1967 through the combined efforts of the students and faculty at the University of Utah. This card has been reproduced here with the permission of the Course Evaluation Committee.

The following questions require a response based on a seven-point scale. The meaning on the end-points is designated in each case. Note that four (4) is the midpoint. Answer only those questions which apply to this particular class. Place your rating in the box to the right of the question. Please complete the reverse side of this card.

Rate the extent to which:

You felt the instructor was well prepared each day.

Poorly Prepared = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Well Prepared

The instructor explained the material so you could understand it.

Poorly = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Well

You felt the instructor responded effectively to students' questions.

Ineffective = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Effective

The instructor stimulated your interest in the course material.

Very Little = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

You felt examinations were reasonable.

Unreasonable = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Reasonable

The assigned readings added to your understanding of the course material.

Very Little = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

You would recommend this course from this instructor to someone like yourself.

Not At All = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Highly

UNIVERSITY

of

UTAH

COURSE

EVALUATION

Your instructor would like to know something he has done especially well in teaching this course. Please be specific.

Your instructor would also like to know something he especially needs to improve. Again, be specific.

Figure 1. Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
1967-1968.

As a result of the experience gained in producing the initial course evaluations, the Course Evaluation Committee revised the questions on the questionnaire to be used during the evaluation of courses taught during the Autumn Quarter 1969-70. The new questionnaire is shown in Figure 2.

The following questions require a response based on a seven-point scale. The meaning on the end points is designated in each case. Note that four (4) is the midpoint. Answer only those questions which apply to this particular class. Place your rating in the box to the right of the question. Please complete the reverse side of this card.

Rate the extent to which:

the instructor explains the material as you can understand it.
Poorly = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Well

you feel the instructor contributes time and effort to the course.
Very Little = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

the instructor provides you with helpful comments on your course efforts.
Very Few = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

this course is a valuable learning experience.
Not At All = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

the assigned readings add to your understanding of the course material.
Very Little = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

you contribute time and effort to the course.
Very Little = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Much

In general, how would you rate all of the classes you have taken at the University?
Very Poor = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 = Very Good

UNIVERSITY
of
UTAH
COURSE
EVALUATION

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

PLEASE COMPLETE
REVERSE SIDE
PLEASE PUT YOUR
RATINGS IN THE BOXES
PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY
RATINGS OTHER THAN
1 THROUGH 7
ARE NOT TABULATED

Rev. 10-19-67

The scales on the reverse side of this card do not tell your instructor what to change and what to keep in his approach to teaching. Please use this side of the card to comment on the ratings you made on the reverse side. Your comments will have their greatest impact if you confine them to specific good and bad aspects of the instructor's approach.

Figure 2. Course Evaluation Questionnaire 1969-1970.

The first line always contains the course number, section, and the instructor's name. The second line tells the number of students enrolled in this particular class, the percentage of students who are majors in this department, and the percentage of students taking this class on a Pass-Fail basis. The third line gives the percentage of students in the class that are graduate, upper, or lower division

students. The fourth line is the percentage of each of the grades given in this class.

The graph which follows the "information lines" is the summary of the class response to the questionnaire. The numbers 1-7 at the top of the graph correspond to the seven possible responses on the questionnaire. A response of "7" is considered excellent, a response of "1" is considered poor. The left side of the graph lists the seven questions in abbreviated form.

To the right of each question there is an asterisk (*), an "I", and a bar (---). The asterisk (*) represents the mean response or rating for all instructors of all classes on this particular question. The "I" represents the mean response for this particular instructor. Thus one can compare the "I" to the (*) to determine whether the instructor is above or below the University average on any particular question. If the "I" is to the right of the asterisk (*), the instructor is above average on that question. If the "I" is to the left of the asterisk (*), the instructor is below the average of his fellow instructors.

The bar (---) is an indication of how closely the students agreed in responding to the question. A long bar suggests that the class gave a wide range of responses on

the question. A short bar (--I-) is a more significant response than an "I" surrounded by a long bar (----I----).

One or more questions in a class report may be preceded by a triangle (<). This signifies that more than 25% of the students who returned evaluations cards for the class, did not answer that question.

It should also be noted that a response of 75% or over was required in order for the summaries to be published. The average return rate varied slightly for the entire university, but averages approximately 75%.

		<u>E X A M P L E</u>						
MEDITATION 104-1		MAHARISHI GURU						
300 STUDENTS		30% MAJORS			10% PASS-FAIL			
5% LOWER; 60% UPPER; 35% GRADUATE								
GRADES 10% A; 25% B; 40% C; 10% D; 10% P; 5% E								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
PREPAR:			--I--		*			
EXPLAN:					--*--I--			
RESPON:					-----I---			
STIMUL:					-----I*--			
EXAMIN:					-----*I----			
TEXT:			-----I----		*			
RECOM:							* --I--	

Figure 3. Sample of the completed questionnaire.

The course evaluations for the Department of Military Science appeared in each of the four course evaluation publications. It should be noted, however, that the response varied with each publication.

One difficulty which the author experienced was that in some cases the student response fell below the desired minimum responses required for publication which resulted in the failure of the evaluation for that course to be published. As a result, the information on the Military Science Department was obtained from the "print outs" resulting from the evaluation tabulations. Thus, the 75% return minimum established by the A. S. U. U. Course Evaluation Committee does not apply in each instance to the results which appear in the following figures.

MIL S	ALL VALID CLASSES						
ENROLLMENT-	258,			0% MAJORS,		0% PASS-FAIL	
CLASS LEVEL -	64% LOWER,			35% UPPER,		0% GRADUATE	
GRADES- (%)	- 24 A,	28B,	38 C,	6 D,	0 P,	1 E.	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
PREPAR:						-*-I-----	
EXPLAN:						-----*-I-----	
RESPON:						-----*I-----	
STIMUL:						-----*I-----	
EXAMIN:						-----*I-----	
TEXT:						-----I-*-----	
RECOMM:						-----*I-----	

Figure 4. Military Science Department Course Evaluation results, Winter Quarter 1967-1968.

MIL S ALL VALID CLASSES

ENROLLMENT- 286, 0% MAJORS 0% PASS-FAIL 67% RETURN

CLASS LEVEL- 66% LOWER, 33% UPPER, 1% GRADUATE

GRADES- 16% A, 41% B, 29% C, 10% D, 3% E, 0% U.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PREPAR: -*-I-----

EXPLAN: -----*---I----

RESPON: -----I*-----

STIMUL: -----*---I-----

EXAMIN: -----*---I-----

TEXT: -----*---I-----

RECOMM: -----*---I-----

Figure 5. Military Science Department Course Evaluation results, Winter Quarter 1967-1968.

MIL S ALL VALID CLASSES 50% RETURN

ENROLLMENT- 186, 0% MAJORS 0% PASS-FAIL

CLASS LEVEL- 52% LOWER, 27% UPPER, 3% GRADUATE.

GRADES- 18% A, 28% B, 42% C, 8% D, 0% P, 1% E, 0% U.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PREPAR: -*-I-----

EXPLAN: -----*---I----

RESPON: -----I*-----

STIMUL: -----I*-----

EXAMIN: -----I*-----

READING: -----I*-----

RECOMM: -----I*-----

Figure 6. Military Science Department Course Evaluation results, Winter Quarter 1968-1969.

MIL S	ALL VALID CLASSES	47% RETURN
ENROLLMENT-	112	3% MAJORS, 0% PASS-FAIL
CLASS LEVEL-	63% LOWER, 35% UPPER,	3% GRADUATE
GRADES-	15% A, 34% B, 40% C, 2% D, 0% F, 4% E, 0% U.	
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
INST EXPLAN:		*---I-----
INST EFFORT:		-----*I----
COMMENTS:		---*---I-----
LEARN EXPER:		-----*I-----
READING:		-----I-----
(STAND EFFRT):		-----I---*---
(ALL CLSSES):		----I-----

Figure 7. Military Science Department Course Evaluation results, Autumn Quarter 1969-1970.

In the preceding figures it may be seen that the position of the "I" representing the mean response for the Military Science Department instructors was equal to or exceeded the rating for all instructors of all classes in the majority of cases.

II. A. S. U. U. OPINION POLL

At the time when advance registration materials were sent out to all prospective students at the University of Utah for registration for the Autumn Quarter 1969-70, the Associated Students of the University of Utah enclosed a questionnaire concerning the role of the ROTC program.¹² This questionnaire was directed to all of the students at

¹²The results of that questionnaire were also published as part of the AD HOC Committee Report and may be found in Appendix 3.

at the University, both male and female, and was intended to ascertain the opinion of the students concerning the status of the ROTC program on the University campus.

There were 14,000 questionnaires sent out; of these, 8,400, or 60% were returned. The results of the poll are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10.

STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE ASUU OPINION POLL, AUTUMN 1969

ITEM	SUBJECT	MALE	FEMALE
1	<u>Students answering the poll.</u>		
	Freshmen	270	186
	Sophomores	1127	723
	Juniors.	1298	621
	Seniors.	1366	691
	Graduate Students. . .	759	246
	Total	4870	2486
2	<u>Are you an ROTC Cadet?</u>		
	Yes.	270	-
	No	4523	-
3	In your opinion, should ROTC be:		
	a. On-Campus but extra-curricular?	1327 (27.2%)	643 (25.8%)*
	b. Given academic credit as now?	2607 (53.5%)	1256 (50.9%)
	c. Completely off campus	523 (10.7%)	184 (7.4%)
	d. No opinion.	355 (7.3%)	364 (14.7%)
4	Should ROTC courses for credit be taught by:		
	a. Civilian faculty. .	661 (13.6%)	181 (7.3%)
	b. Military personnel.	2977 (61.1%)	1461 (58.8%)
	c. No opinion.	966 (19.8%)	364 (14.6%)

TABLE 10 - continued.

ITEM	SUBJECT	MALE	FEMALE
5	In your opinion, is ROTC in conflict with the traditional ideals of the university, such as academic freedom and freedom of political expression?		
	a. Yes.	968 (19.8%)	322 (12.5%)
	b. No	3501 (72.8%)	1780 (71.6%)
	c. No opinion	368 (7.5%)	354 (14.2%)

It should be noted, that over 50% of the students answering the poll (61.1% male, and 58.8% female) felt that ROTC courses should be taught by the military instructors, whereas only a small percentage of the students answering the poll were in favor of having the ROTC classes taught by civilian instructors. It is interesting to note that the male students who potentially could be most affected by the program were in favor of having the military do the instructing.

It should also be noted, that in the opinion of the students the ROTC program should be continued on the campus with the same academic status it presently has.

III. AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT- ROTC AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

The University of Utah was relatively free of many of the problems which beset the campuses of colleges and universities throughout the United States. One of the reasons for this was the apparent attitude of the University administration towards resolving many of these potential problems before they occurred. It therefore seemed to be a logical step for the University to take to initiate a study of the ROTC on the University campus to determine the facts surrounding it, and to assess the attitude of the students concerning it.

In keeping with this policy, an AD HOC Committee was appointed to investigate the ROTC program and to report to the administration on their findings.¹³ It is not within the scope of this study to review all of the various aspects of that committee's work, but rather to extract from it that portion that has a bearing on the study at hand, particularly as it lends validity to the findings of this study.

¹³AD HOC Committee to study ROTC, (unpublished report with limited distribution, University of Utah, 1970).

The report submitted by the committee at the completion of their work incorporated the results of the student opinion poll which appears earlier in this study. It also referred to a questionnaire which was prepared and administered under the supervision of the College of Letters and Science. Portions of that questionnaire relate specifically to the subject at hand, the AROTC Instructor. (The results of that portion of the questionnaire which pertains to this study appear in the following table.) Items extracted from that questionnaire that pertained specifically to this study were:

6. Compared to all of the teachers you have had at the University, do you think your ROTC instructors are: a. below average, b. average, c above average?
7. Do you believe your ROTC instructors are both qualified and prepared to teach their subjects?
 - a. Yes. b. No.

TABLE 11
ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions from Questionnaire	AROTC Cadet's Response	
	No.	%
No. 6. ROTC Instructors:	Below Average.	18 6.95
	Average. . . .	124 45.42
	Above Average.	<u>131</u> <u>47.99</u>
	Total	273 100.00
No. 7. ROTC Instructors	Qualified. . .	271 97.84
	Not Qualified.	<u>7</u> <u>2.52</u>
	Total	278 100.00

The response of the AROTC students indicated that the AROTC instructor was well above average when compared to other instructors at the University. Their overwhelming positive response to the questions concerning the qualifications of their AROTC instructors to teach their various subjects gives further indication of the successful results achieved through the instruction given in the Military Science Department.

IV. SUMMARY

The question of the adequacy of the military personnel assigned to the AROTC programs at the University to teach on a university level has been one fraught with many unanswered questions. Comparison of the results of their teaching with

that of the other instructional personnel at the University of Utah was first made possible with the introduction of a system of student course evaluations conducted by the Associated Students of the University of Utah.

The questionnaire developed for this purpose was made up of a standard set of questions concerning the individual courses of instruction and the instructor. This evaluation is limited in the number of factors considered and is taken only from the students point of view.

The average return rate for the evaluations University-wide was 75%. To qualify for publication the class response had to meet this requirement. Unfortunately, not all of the AROTC classes met this criteria. In this area, the evaluations published for the Army ROTC classes reflect the results obtained from the original "print outs" rather than from the actual publications.

The results of the questionnaires reflect that in spite of the frequent turnover in instructor personnel in the AROTC Department, the positive response of the students to their instruction, remains at a consistently high level. This would indicate that the quality of instruction provided by the AROTC instructors remains relatively constant.

reach One area in which there were consistent indications that a deficiency exists is that of text material. In three of the four published reports the evaluation given to the text materials used for the courses was below the average evaluation for all other classes at the University.

AROTC The report published for the Autumn Quarter 1969-70 recorded a new area, that of student effort. Though there is insufficient evidence on which to base a judgement at this time, this area, due to the nature of the program, could indicate a need for close attention and possible revisions in the program to bring required student effort in line with the average University requirements. It should be noted that the rating given for all classes at the University and all AROTC classes was the same.

The A. S. U. U. Opinion Poll produced certain interesting results, particularly in terms of student attitude to the need for an officer training program on the university campus. Of the 4870 males responding to the poll, only 275 were members of the ROTC program. This represents a percentage of only 5.7% and would have had little or no effect on the outcome of the poll. Significantly, the number of students responding favorably to the question of who should

teach the military classes, the military or civilian instructors, was four to one for the men, and eight to one for the women in favor of the military.

CHAPTER IV.

THE "IDEAL" INSTRUCTOR

"The only good way of judging the quality of college teaching is by means of the products of the college. ...if there is a better way of evaluating good teaching we have yet to discover it."¹⁴

Teaching has been the center of controversy and probably always will be. The reason for this is that the results of teaching can never be reduced to an exact science, to the point where identifiable stimuli will produce the same results in each student. Because of this, teachers will always be subject to criticism from both fellow teachers and students who question the validity of the teaching techniques used. What works for one person is not that which will work for another. "The results of a teacher's efforts will depend upon the interaction of numerous unpredictable factors between two variable personalities."¹⁵

Despite the obvious intangibles involved in teaching, there are those qualities which have been identified as

¹⁴Fernandus Payne and Evelyn W. Spieth, An Open Letter to College Teachers, (Bloomington, Ind.: The Principia Press, Inc., 1935), p. 2.

¹⁵Ibid. p. 1.

contributing to the success of a teacher. The United States Army, recognizing this fact, has set up a course in Methods of Instruction for the express purpose of preparing its officers to provide the highest quality of instruction possible. How successful it has been is demonstrated by the quality of the training received by the man in the Army, and most certainly by the results of that training.

That the program of instruction followed by the Army in providing training for the men in the Army has been successful does not mean that it would be successful on the university campus. That this has been the case, is documented in reports concerning the ROTC program referred to earlier in this study.¹⁶ It was the purpose of this study to determine if this situation still exists, or if the development of basic teaching techniques by the Army has resulted in a noticeable improvement which would produce positive results on a par with those of the professional teacher on the university campus.

To accomplish this evaluation, the results of the student course evaluations have been obtained which appear in

¹⁶The ROTC Study Committee of Colgate University, "The Impact of an ROTC Program on a Liberal Arts College: A Case Study of Colgate University", Hamilton, New York, 1953.

the preceeding chapter. As noted however, these evaluations were confined to the possible responses determined by the questions asked. There are obviously factors other than just those mentioned in the questionnaire which contribute to the success of a teacher.

In his study, "Qualities Related to Success in Teaching", Frederick B. Knight states that though the teaching profession has been sensitive to the problems related to determining what constitutes good teaching, no one has come up with the exact formula as yet.¹⁷ We do not know what traits must be present in superior instructors. Knight continued with his studies to attempt to define what these traits are.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITERIA.

In March of 1968 an examination was given to the Junior students in the English Department of the Brigham Young University. The purpose of the examination was to demonstrate the students' proficiency in the use of the English language. The topic upon which they were required to write was, "My Most Memorable Teacher".

¹⁷Frederic B. Knight, Qualities Related to Teaching, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1922), p. 4.

It should be noted that the purpose of the examination was not to determine what goes into the makeup of a memorable teacher, but rather, to evaluate the student's use of his writing skill. Because of this, the results of that test are perhaps a more accurate indication of the factors which effected the student most in his relationships with his teachers than if he were asked to specifically record them for a study such as this. In this instance, the response was not effected by the anticipated grade on the paper for what the student wrote but rather how he expressed himself in writing.

There are specific questions relating to the validity of the criteria developed as a result of this study. These questions must be kept in mind when considering the results. First, the general nature of the school where the examination was given was that of a "church school" and therefore, how much was the list of criteria effected by the image of the religion instructor? Second, what is the background of the students who attend that school in terms of educational experience? Third, what effect did the time limitation in the examination have upon the completeness of the results?

The technique used in developing the criteria was that of preparing a list of the descriptive adjectives or phrases used in the completed examinations to describe the most memorable teacher. The list of descriptive terms was then presented to several members of the faculty in the Department of Education for their consideration and comments. Their suggestions were then incorporated, where possible, in the questionnaire. In addition to the items on the questionnaire many characteristics were mentioned such as petite, handsome, sarcastic, warm-hearted, which were too general or vague in meaning to be of value in this study.

II. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In order for there to be a means of comparison, a questionnaire was developed in which the 18 most frequently mentioned characteristics were listed.¹⁸ The AROTC students were asked to respond to the questionnaire, rating the AROTC instructors as they compare with all other instructors at the University of Utah.

III. METHOD

Following development of the questionnaire, the course directors for each phase of the AROTC program were asked to

¹⁸The questionnaire is shown as Appendix 1.

have the members of their classes respond to the questionnaire. The results were submitted to the author, compiled and evaluated. To assist in the evaluation, Turney's Simplified Statistics for Education and Psychology was consulted.¹⁹ The evaluated results of the questionnaire appear in the following tables.

¹⁹ Billy L. Turney and George P. Robb, Simplified Statistics for Education and Psychology, (Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1968), pp. 37-49.

TABLE 12

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AROT STUDENTS - TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

Rating scale: 1 - Very Below Average, 2 - Below Average, 3 - Average, 4 - Above Average
 5 - Very Above Average.

CHARACTERISTIC	FREQ.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1. Able to communicate with the student	No. 13	2 .85	8 3.41	47 20.08	131 55.98	45 19.23	233 100.00
2. Appropriately Dressed	No. 12	- -	2 .85	20 8.55	58 24.79	153 65.38	233 100.00
3. Demonstrates concern for others	No. 10	2 .85	9 3.85	88 37.61	106 45.30	29 12.39	234 100.00
4. Enthusiastic	No. 36	- -	3 1.29	45 19.23	120 51.28	68 29.06	236 100.00
5. Fair	No. 10	7 2.99	12 5.13	85 36.32	91 38.89	38 16.23	233 100.00
6. Has a genuine interest in the student	No. 32	3 1.29	9 3.85	81 34.62	113 48.29	30 12.86	236 100.00
7. Has a sense of humor	No. 32	2 .85	6 2.56	44 18.80	118 50.43	65 27.78	235 100.00
8. Identifies with the student	No. 13	5 2.14	20 8.55	82 34.62	100 42.74	30 12.86	237 100.00

TABLE 12 - continued.

Rating scale: 1 - Very Below Average, 2 - Below Average, 3 - Average, 4 - Above Average 5 - Very Above Average.		FREQ.				
CHARACTERISTIC		1	2	3	4	5 TOTAL
9. Is dedicated to his work	No. 18	-	3	28	112	91 234
	%	-	1.29	11.97	47.86	38.89 100.00
10. Is demanding in his requirements	No. 19	1	9	89	91	47 237
	%	.43	3.85	38.03	38.89	20.08 100.00
11. Is devoted to his students	No. 12	3	17	96	95	24 235
	%	1.29	7.26	41.03	40.60	10.26 100.00
12. Promotes appreciation	No. 11	4	17	92	91	30 234
	%	1.71	7.26	39.32	38.89	12.86 100.00
13. Shows concern for others	No. 28	3	11	104	100	19 237
	%	1.29	4.70	44.44	42.74	8.12 100.00
14. Sincere	No. 19	-	2	68	107	60 237
	%	-	.85	29.06	45.73	25.64 100.00
15. Subject knowledge	No. 56	-	2	45	86	105 238
	%	-	.85	19.23	36.75	44.87 100.00
16. Takes time for students	No. 11	1	3	58	122	52 236
	%	.43	1.29	24.79	52.13	22.22 100.00
17. Well prepared	No. 18	-	3	46	113	71 233
	%	-	1.29	19.66	48.29	30.34 100.00
18. Willing to spend extra time with the student	No. 18	-	7	63	104	55 229
	%	-	2.99	26.50	44.44	23.93 100.00

The results of the questionnaire support the results of the student course evaluations mentioned in Chapter III. Previous studies on teacher traits point out that subject knowledge ranked number one in the surveys which they conducted. The results of the AROTC questionnaire indicate that 44.8% of the students rated their AROTC instructors very above average in this regard. Enthusiasm was ranked second in this study in importance and in this regard 80.34% of the students rated the AROTC instructor above average. Third in importance in this study was item No. 6, "Has a genuine interest in the student". AROTC students' response resulted in 61.15% indicating that their AROTC instructors are above average or better.

IV. SUMMARY

A questionnaire was developed which listed the characteristics of the "Ideal Instructor". It was based on the results of a Junior English Proficiency Examination administered at the Brigham Young University. The topic of the examination was "My Most Memorable Teacher". A list of characteristics was compiled against which the AROTC instructor was rated as he compares with all other instructors at the University of Utah.

There were potentially 285 students to whom the questionnaire could be given. However, class absences resulted in a reduction in the number of questionnaires returned. A total of 237 were returned which represents 82% of the AROTC students enrolled at the time the questionnaire was completed.

Positive for this study were: (1) to review the criteria for the selection, preparation, and assignment of AROTC instructors; (2) to evaluate the students' response to the instruction provided by the AROTC; (3) to obtain a comparison of the AROTC instructor with his contemporaries who are judged in light of recognized, positive teaching traits.

The results of the student course evaluations were compiled and presented in graphic form, which facilitated the review of the results.

The A. S. U. V. Opinion Poll was reviewed and interpreted for this study. Specific note was made of the non-AROTC locality of the respondents. A general consensus of the results of that poll indicates that the AROTC should be retained on the University of Utah campus in the same status that it presently occupies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the AROTC instructor at the University of Utah.

The specific objectives for this study were: (1) to review the criteria for the selection, preparation, and assignment of AROTC instructors; (2) to examine the students' response to the instruction provided by the AROTC; (3) to obtain a comparison of the AROTC instructor with his contemporaries when considered in light of recognized, positive teaching traits.

The results of the student course evaluations were compiled and presented in graphic form, which facilitated the review of the results.

The A. S. U. U. Opinion Poll was reviewed and interpreted for this study. Specific note was made of the non-ROTC identity of the respondents. A general consensus of the results of that poll indicates that the ROTC should be retained on the University of Utah campus in the same status that it presently occupies.

The recent report of the AD HOC Committee to study ROTC at the University of Utah was included to lend validity to this study. Of specific interest was the results of a portion of that report which indicated that 92% of the AROTC students felt that their AROTC instructors were average or better when compared with their contemporaries on the University faculty. Over 97% (271 responding) felt that their AROTC instructors were qualified to teach at the University.

A questionnaire was developed using positive teacher characteristics extracted from 224 Junior English Achievement Examinations written on the topic of "My Most Memorable Teacher".

II CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions seemed to be warranted on the basis of this study:

1. The AROTC instructor assigned to the University of Utah is selected on a set of rigid criteria which are consistent with the practical requirements for educational background, experience, and demonstrated ability.
2. Student evaluations indicate that the AROTC instructor is above the average of the teachers at the University of Utah in most areas, texts or reading material being the primary exception.

3. When compared with the image of the "Ideal Instructor", the AROTC instructor is ranked consistently above his contemporaries.

4. Based on the combined considerations brought out in this study, the criticism frequently heard on the college campus concerning the adequacy of the AROTC instructor is unfounded.

5. The United States Army is cognizant of the need to continually update its ROTC program as evidenced by its efforts to comply with requests for more academically qualified instructor personnel.

6. The apparent reasons for the success of the AROTC instructor on the University campus is due in part to the training in Methods of Instruction they receive.

III RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of this study the following recommendations are proposed:

1. It is recommended that all teachers at the University be required to attend a course of instruction on the methods or techniques of instruction before assuming their duties.

2. Many of the problems associated with the AROTC stem from the fact that most individuals are not familiar with

the actual work being done in the department. It is therefore recommended that an increased effort be made to provide the non-ROTC student with a better image of the ROTC program as sponsored by the faculty and administration.

3. A great deal of material was available for research in the areas touched on in this study. Unfortunately, neither time nor circumstances were conducive to enlarging the scope of this study. As a result, there is a great deal of work yet to be done in the area of the AROTC. It is recommended that future studies on the AROTC consider the areas of the nature of the AROTC student body, student motivation, characteristics of instructor/student relationships by class year, etc.

4. It is recommended that a closer working relationship be developed between the Department of Military Science and other related departments in the University. This could result in a team teaching effort combining the best of both academic and professional backgrounds with the student gaining the benefit.

5. Finally, it is recommended that it be required of all AROTC instructors to participate in the academic of the University thus exposing them to the world of the "Ivory

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ad Hoc Committee to Study ROTC. Report submitted to the University of Utah, 1970.
- Army Digest Staff. "ROTC Under Fire." Army Digest, April, 1969, pp. 10-17.
- Associated Students of the University of Utah. Faculty-Course Evaluation. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, Winter Quarter, 1968-69.
- Cravens, Kenneth F. "ROTC at the University of Utah." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Utah, 1958.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. Army Regulation, No. 611-50, Assignment to Reserve Component and Reserve Officer Training Corps Duty. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.
- Headquarters, United States Continental Army Command. "7th Annual ROTC Conference." Fort Monroe, Va., 1969.
- Knight, Frederic B. Qualities Related to Teaching. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1922.
- Payne, Fernandus, and Spieth, Evelyn W. An Open Letter to College Teachers. Bloomington, Ind.: The Principia Press, Inc., 1935.
- Shannon, John R. Personal and Social Traits Requisite for High Grade Teaching in Secondary Schools. Terre Haute, Ind.: State Normal Press, 1927.
- The Officer Education Advisory Committee. "Factual Analysis of Matters Relating to the ROTC Program at the University of Washington." Seattle, Wash., 1969.
- The ROTC Study Committee of Colgate University. "The Impact of an ROTC Program on a Liberal Arts College: A Case Study of Colgate University." Hamilton, New York, 1953.

Tomlinson, Kenneth Y. "ROTC Under Attack." Reader's Digest, November, 1966, pp. 2-6.

Turney, Billy L., and Robb, George P. Simplified Statistics for Education and Psychology. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1968.

U. S. Department of the Army. FM 21-6, Techniques of Military Instruction. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AROTC STUDENTS

INSTRUCTIONS

Do not write your name on this questionnaire. When completing the items below, use the following scale:

5 - Very above average.

4 - Above average.

3 - Average.

2 - Below average.

1 - Very below average.

Rate the AROTC instructors on the following factors as they compare with all other teachers (instructors) at the University of Utah.

1. Able to communicate with the students ____.
2. Appropriately dressed ____.
3. Demonstrates concern for others ____.
4. Enthusiastic ____.
5. Fair ____.
6. Has a genuine interest in the student ____.
7. Has a good sense of humor ____.
8. Identifies with the student ____.
9. Is dedicated to his work ____.
10. Is demanding in his requirements ____.
11. Is devoted to his students ____.
12. Promotes appreciation ____.
13. Shows concern for others ____.
14. Sincere ____.
15. Subject knowledge ____.
16. Takes time for students ____.
17. Well prepared ____.
18. Willing to spend extra time with the student ____.

APPENDIX 2

ROTC INSTRUCTOR TRAINING COURSE

SAMPLE TRAINING SCHEDULE

HEADQUARTERS
SIXTH US ARMY ROTC CAMP
Fort Lewis, Washington

OT 23 July 1968
SUBJECT: Training Schedule, ROTC Instructor Orientation
Course, 29 July - 2 August 1968

TO: See Distribution

1. Attached is the ROTC Instructor Orientation Course Schedule for 29 July - 2 August 1968.
2. Instruction will be conducted in Building 3203, 2d Division Drive, at times indicated on schedule.
3. Uniform and equipment:
 - a. Uniform: Fatigues with boots.
 - b. Equipment: Notebook and pencil.

FOR THE DEPUTY CAMP COMMANDER:

JOHN D. SHANNON
Maj, Inf
Adjutant

Incl: Tng Sched
Distribution:

B except: S4 (4), S3 (50)
CO each Co (4)

Plus: Cmdt of Cadets (2) Chaplain (2)
Post G3 Tng (4), Post G4 (2)
Each student (2)
Each instructor (1)

ROTC INSTRUCTOR ORIENTATION COURSE 1968
Fort Lewis, Washington

TRAINING SCHEDULE
FROM 29 Jul to 2 Aug 1968

DAY & DATE	HOURS FROM TO	SUBJECT	PLACE	INSTRUCTOR	UNIFORM & EQUIPMENT	INSTRUCTOR REFERENCES
Mon 29 Jul	0600-0810	Welcome	Bldg 3203	Col V.G. Gilbert Dep Cg Cmdr U of San Fran- else	Petigues & boots. Note book & pencil	None
	0810-0930	Introduction to ROTC	Do	LTC S.E. Andrews, U of Alabama	Do	AR 145-5 and ROTC 145-10
	0900-0950	ROTC Policies and Procedures	Do	LTC Bralley, ROTC Div, DCSOFT, Hq Sixth Army	Do	AR 145-5, AR 145-25, AR 145-40, AR 145-59, AR 145-120, AR 145- 350, CON Reg 145-4 and CON Reg 145-6
	0950-1010	Coffee Break				
	1010-1100	ROTC Policies and Procedures	Do	Mr. Beliscol and Mr. Deady DCSOFT, Hq Sixth Army	Do	Same as for 0930-0950
	1110-1200	General Duties and Responsibilities of PMS and Instructor Personnel	Do	Col E. Curtis U of Oregon	Do	
	1200-1315	Lunch				
	1315-1405	College Organization, Duties of PMS, cont'd	Do	Panel	Do	
	1415-1605	Methods of Instruction	Do	Maj D. L. McShane, UCLA	Do	FM 21-6
	1605-1700	Preparation of Student Lesson Presentations				
Tues 30 Jul	0800-0950	Methods of Instruction	Bldg 3203	Maj L.I. Lynn U of Arizona	Do	FM 21-6
	0950-1010	Coffee Break				
	1010-1100	ROTC Administration	Do	Mr. Ligier, Reserve Forces Div, AG, Hq Sixth Army	Do	AR 145-95, AR 145-100, AR 145-124 and AR 145-133
	1110-1200	Amy-sponsored Programs for ROTC cadets. PMS and Scholarship Programs. ROTC Flight Program	Do	Mr. Ligier LTC Bralley	Do	AR 145-355, AR 601-107 and Annex AO to CON Reg 350-1
	1200-1315	Lunch				

ROTC INSTRUCTOR ORIENTATION COURSE 1968
Fort Lewis, Washington

TRAINING SCHEDULE
FROM 29 Jul to 2 Aug 1968

DAY & DATE	HOURS FROM TO	SUBJECT	PLACE	INSTRUCTION	UNIFORM & EQUIPMENT	INSTRUCTOR REFERENCES
Tues 30 Jul	1315-1505	Philosophy of Education in the American Colleges and Universities	Bldg 3203	Father Robert Bradley, Seattle U	Fatigues & boots, Note book & pencil	
	1515-1605	Recruiting Techniques	Do	LTC G. L. Blohna, Do U of Washington	Do	Con Reg 145-8 and CON PGM 145-1
	1605-1700	Preparation of Student Lesson Presentations				
Wed 31 Jul	0800-0850	ROTC Curriculum	Do	Col W.O. Witherspoon, Jr., Idaho State U	Do	ATP 145-1
	0900-0950	ROTC Curriculum - MS I	Do	Maj P.A. Chalmers, Do San Jose State	Do	ATP 145-1 and ROTCM 145-45
	1010-1100	ROTC Supply Procedures	Do	CPT Cepurro, Supply Do Div, DSELOG, Hq Sixth Army	Do	AP 145-421
	1110-1200	ROTC Summer Camps	Do	Maj J.B. Wallace, Do Ariz. State U	Do	Ar 145-30 and Annex AM and AR to CON Reg 300-1
	1200-1315	Lunch				
	1315-1600	Observe ROTC Cadet Training	Camp Training Area, Assemble at Bldg 3203	Do	Do	
	1600-1700	Student Lesson Presentations	Bldg 3203	LTC Andrews, Do LTC Hart, Do Maj Phipps	Do	PM 21-6
Thu 1 Aug	1830-2230	Student Lesson Presentations	Do	Do	Do	Do
	0800-0850	ROTC Curriculum - Leadership Laboratory	Do	Maj R.J. Enead, U of U	Do	ATP 145-1
	0900-0950	ROTC Curriculum - MS II	Do	LTC E.P. Hart, Ariz. State U	Do	ATP 145-1 and ROTCM 145-20
	0950-1010	Coffee Break	Do			
	1010-1100	Information Activities	Do	Col Dick Gebura, Montana St U	Do	DA Cir 360-2, Con PGM 145-1, AR 360-5 and AR 360-61
	1110-1200	Selection Procedures for the ROTC Advanced Course	Do	Maj R.P. Ferriant, Seattle U	Do	AR 145-550, Con Reg 145-6, and CON Reg 145-8
	1200-1315	Lunch				

ROTC INSTRUCTOR ORIENTATION COURSE 1968
Fort Lewis, Washington

TRAINING SCHEDULE
FROM 29 Jul to 2 Aug 1968

DATE	DAY & HOURS	FROM	TO	SUBJECT	PLACE	INSTRUCTION	UNIFORM & EQUIPMENT	INSTRUCTOR REFERENCES
Thu 1 Aug				Military Educational Material Support of the ROTC	Bldg 3203	Dept of Nonres- ident Instruction, US Army Inf Sch	Fatigue & Boots, Penell & notebook	Annex AP to CON Reg 350-1
				Relationship Between ROTC Instructor Group Personnel and ROTC Institutional Officials	Do	Dr. James I. Mueller, U of Washington	Do	
				Student Lesson Presentations	Do	LTC Andrews	Do	FM 91-6
				Student Lesson Presentations	Do	LTC Hart, Maj Phillips	Do	FM 91-6
				ROTC Curriculum - NS III	Do	LTC F.X. Dadds	Do	ATP 145-1
Fri 2 Aug				ROTC Curriculum - NS IV	Do	Maj T.P. Storey	Do	ATP 145-1 and ROTC 145-1-1
				Coffee Break		UC Berkeley		
				Extracurricular and Community Activities	Do	Maj O.P. Phillips, U of Washington	Do	AR 360-61
				Clearance				

APPENDIX 3

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT-

ROTC AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

MEMORANDUM

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Academic Vice President

From: Jerry R. Andersen Date: April 16, 1970
To: Deans Subject: ROTC Report
Department Chairman
Faculty Council Members

I have received a report of the ad hoc committee appointed last year to study the relationship of ROTC to the University. This report will undoubtedly be on the agenda of the Faculty Council soon.

Because of the wide interest in the report and because of its implications to academic programming, I am sending the report out now to all deans, department chairmen, and Faculty Council members so that there will be ample opportunity to consider its implications before any final decisions to implement the report are made.

JRA

Encl.

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Salt Lake City 84112

The College of
Letters and Science
Office of the Dean

6 June 1969

Dr. Thomas C. King
Academic Vice President
Park 205
Campus

Dear Dr. King:

At its meeting yesterday, 5 June 1969, the Committee to Study ROTC approved the following preliminary report:

The Committee to Study ROTC has met four times and wishes now to present a preliminary report defining the scope and aims of its deliberations.

We hope to investigate the professional and academic aims of the three military departments on the campus, to assess the degree of success the course offerings of those departments enjoy in meeting professional and academic aims; to investigate the ground on which credit is offered in all military classes, including credit offered for activity in auxiliary organizations such as Angel Flight, Army Sponsors and Nalads; to investigate the practice of giving credit for such activities as summer camp.

We intend to explore to what degree students who affiliate with ROTC limit their political expression because of military expectations regarding loyalty or conformity.

We also intend to examine the appointment procedures observed in military departments and the degree to which the university is able to exercise quality control over appointments and retention in these departments.

We shall also ask whether the absence of customary tenure provisions in these departments has any effect on the academic freedom which tenure is alleged to protect.

If the above can be approached objectively and dispassionately, we feel that the larger question of whether ROTC has a legitimate academic role on a university campus might then be raised with some hope of an answer based on fact and reason.

The committee is composed of the following persons by the action is amended, along with the following members of the committee: James L. Clayton, Edwin B. Firmage, and its preliminary report submitted to the University of North Carolina.

James L. Clayton
Edwin B. Firmage
Albert L. Fisher
Michael Mattsson
Charles W. Smith, Jr.
Bangs L. Tapscott
Robert A. Wolbach
James L. Bever
James A. Brinton
Steven H. Gunn
Frank C. Overfelt

1. The committee is composed of the following persons by the action is amended, along with the following members of the committee:

2. The committee is composed of the following persons by the action is amended, along with the following members of the committee:

3. The committee is composed of the following persons by the action is amended, along with the following members of the committee:

4. The committee is composed of the following persons by the action is amended, along with the following members of the committee:

MV:pd

cc. Jerry R. Andersen

5. The committee is composed of the following persons by the action is amended, along with the following members of the committee:

AD HOC FINAL REPORT OF THE

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY ROTC

To: Jerry R. Anderson Date: 28 March 1970

The Ad Hoc Committee to Study ROTC submits the following recommendations expressed as motions passed by the committee. Its report explaining and supporting these actions is appended, along with the results of some questionnaires prepared and conducted by the committee, and its preliminary report submitted 6 June 1969.

1. The committee recommends the retention of the ROTC programs at the University of Utah with such modifications as shall be specified.
2. The committee recommends that credit be given for academic work completed in the ROTC curriculum as modified in No. 7 below.
3. It is not morally objectionable for students to receive training at the University of Utah to become military officers.
4. The ROTC training programs have a legitimate academic place on the University of Utah campus.
5. It shall be the policy of the University that, whenever possible, courses required within the ROTC curriculum will be taught by regular civilian personnel within other departments. Special attention will be paid to those courses of substantial political content or concerned largely with U. S. national policy, such as military history, etc., but the University policy extends to all courses which can feasibly be taught in other departments. Implementation of this policy shall be left in the hands of the Curriculum Review Committee of the college to which the departments of military science belong. The University will provide administrative help in negotiating with departments in other colleges for this purpose and will be

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT - continued.

10. prepared to provide budgetary assistance to the departments involved, if necessary.
6. No degree-satisfying majors shall be offered by the departments of military science, naval science and aerospace studies.
7. No academic credit shall be given for classes or activities concerned primarily or exclusively with non-academic military orientation, e.g., indoctrination, drill, drill team, women's auxiliary service activities, training in military skills, summer camp, etc.
8. At the beginning of each academic year, each cadet or midshipman will be informed, in writing, that his participation in ROTC does not place any restriction upon his participation as an individual in legal academic or political activities of any kind, and shall be informed of the administrative channels of appeal and redress which are open to all students. He shall be apprised of those activities frowned upon or forbidden to him as a representative of the military (e.g., while he is in uniform), and of the possible penalties for infractions.
9. Participants in the various ROTC programs shall be thoroughly informed of their commitment to the military at all stages of the program. No contractual agreement between the student and the military shall contain provisions such as to prevent him from completing his bachelor's degree in the normal four-year period, should he decide not to complete the ROTC program, nor shall such contractual agreements provide for his being drafted or called to active duty because his ROTC enrollment is terminated. The committee recognizes that upon termination of the ROTC contract, the student becomes subject to normal draft procedures.

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT - continued.

10. The University Faculty-Student Relations Committee shall serve as an appellate board for matters relating to the military departments, especially for cases of a disciplinary dismissal.
11. The three ROTC departments shall be maintained within the College of Letters and Science, responsible directly to the dean of the college. In the event the college is divided, these departments should become a part of the College of Social and Behavioral Science, with responsibility to the dean of that college.
12. The appointment of ROTC faculty shall be carried out in the regular manner and according to generally accepted academic standards, giving due weight to the importance of military experience in teaching the specialized subjects of military science. A minimal standard for all military faculty should be eligibility for admission to graduate school. Whenever possible, potential appointees should be interviewed prior to their appointment. Departments in areas related to those to be taught by the appointee should, when appropriate, be invited to participate in the interview.
13. The committee recommends the University administration proceed with all due haste to make the following recommendation to the Department of Defense as a supplement to ROTC programs in the light of the military officer recruitment needs of the nation and the best interests of the University of Utah.

The University of Utah encourages the Department of Defense to establish a contractual arrangement which can be entered into by a student in good standing, at the end of two years of college, with the concurrence of the U. S. Army, Navy or Air Force. This contract would provide: (1) that the student will serve in a ten-week summer camp between his third and fourth years of college; (2) that he will enter military service for a

period of two years as an officer in that armed force upon graduation; and (3) that throughout the last two years of college, in compensation for this commitment, the student is to be granted a monthly stipend by the Army, Navy or Air Force comparable to the ROTC stipend being paid at that time.

The committee offers the following report in explanation of the recommendations listed heretofore.

The committee examined the arguments that military studies are far as out of harmony with the academic ideals of a university dedicated to the pursuit of speculative and liberating knowledge, not the science of killing. After extensive discussion, the committee recognized that all universities have found it necessary to defer themselves by way of military appointments. The university, insofar as it has an obligation to the state and society, has a legitimate and appropriate role to play in the training of college-educated military personnel. Furthermore, college-educated officers produced in high ROTC programs represent a lessening of waste since officers become a valuable resource and politically oriented to military establishment. The committee viewed with sympathy the military units already provided by the military academies to officer candidates.

Recommendations

In the scrutiny of the ROTC curricula, the committee was convinced that, with very few exceptions, the subjects that the ability of participation were such as to warrant academic credit. The committee wishes to signal a widespread action that this is a basis for such activities as still and advanced training. When such activities are engaged in at an advanced or mid-level, they do not carry academic credit. The committee recommends, however, that auxiliary activities such as advanced training, defense and flight no longer carry academic credit. The ROTC summer camp, for each candidate, has been available as an officer, no longer be given credit.

REPORT

The University Committee to Study ROTC, appointed last spring, has met 22 times, has heard testimony from faculty, students, cadets and individuals from off campus; has conducted two extensive polls of student opinion and has considered the academic role of the ROTC departments on this campus.

The committee offers the following report in explanation of its recommendations listed heretofore.

The committee examined the arguments that military studies are per se out of harmony with the academic ideals of a university dedicated to the pursuit of meliorative and liberating knowledge, not the science of killing. After extensive discussion, the committee recognized that all societies have found it necessary to defend themselves by way of military establishments. The university, insofar as it has an obligation to meet the needs of society, has a legitimate and appropriate role to play in the training of college-educated military officers. Furthermore, college-educated officers produced through ROTC programs represent a leavening of what might otherwise become a narrowly technical and politically oppressive military establishment. The committee viewed with apprehension an officer corps wholly supplied by the military academies and officer candidate schools.

Curricula

In its scrutiny of the ROTC curricula, the committee was satisfied that, with only very few exceptions, the subject matter and quality of instruction were such as to warrant academic credit. The committee wishes to dispel a widespread notion that credit is offered for such activities as drill and commando tactics. When such activities are engaged in at all by cadets and midshipmen, they do not carry academic credit. The committee recommends, however, that auxiliary activities such as Army Sponsors, Naiads and Angel Flight no longer carry academic credit and that Army ROTC summer camp, for which credit has been available on petition, no longer be granted credit.

In other respects the committee was favorably impressed with the substance of courses in the three ROTC departments. The responses to a questionnaire taken by cadets and midshipmen made it abundantly clear that ROTC courses and instruction compared favorably with other university offerings. Indeed, the testimony of cadets convinced the committee that the quality of instruction was often superior, yielding at times truly independent and creative study. At the same time, the committee welcomed a tendency evident in recent ROTC curriculum revisions calling for civilian departments to teach those subject matters which were clearly appropriate to them. For instance, the Navy, rather than teach military history and national defense strategy within the department of naval science, prefers to have these courses taught by departments of history and political science. The committee accordingly recommends that courses required in the ROTC programs be taught, whenever possible, by the civilian faculty of the University. When this is not possible, such courses may be taught by a qualified military officer but under the purview of a regular academic department.

Inasmuch as the services prefer ROTC cadets and midshipmen to major in other than military subjects, and as the departments of military science and aerospace studies do not offer courses sufficient to constitute an academic major, the committee recommends that the existing majors in military science, naval science and aerospace studies be abolished.

Students

In its study, the committee was much concerned with the rights of students enrolled in ROTC programs. For instance, the committee wondered whether ROTC cadets and midshipmen enjoyed the same academic freedom as other students. Could a cadet, for instance, participate in a legal and peaceful moratorium without fear of repercussion? Many cadets and midshipmen (one-third) responding to the committee's questions on this matter recognized the very real possibility of being subject to questioning and disapproval from their superiors. The committee has no completely satisfactory solution to problems that may arise in this somewhat thorny area where political considerations may enter. Rejecting the idea of a special appellate committee which might settle cases of injustice or violation of student academic freedom,

the committee recommends rather that existing committees, such as Student-Faculty Relations and Academic Freedom, stand ready to review cases referred to them involving termination of ROTC contracts or dismissal from the corps. In this area, the committee further recommends that all prospective ROTC students have their rights, responsibilities and the specific consequences of neglecting responsibilities fully explained to them at the beginning of their program and at such later stages as are necessary for them to be aware of their continuing commitment to the military.

The committee also recommends that no agreement into which a student enters with any of the armed forces shall provide for his being drafted or called to active duty because his ROTC enrollment is terminated. The committee recognizes that he would be subject to normal draft procedures upon termination.

Faculty

With regard to the appointment of ROTC faculty, the committee was agreed that customary university appointment procedures using appropriate standards for the several ranks, should be carefully observed in all cases. In the appointment of the PMS, PNS and PAS, who hold the rank of professor and are the chairmen of their respective departments, an on-campus interview with the candidate should be arranged whenever possible. The committee looked with disfavor on any separation or distinction of ROTC faculty from other faculty and encouraged their maximal integration into the university community through committee appointments and inclusion in all university activities and benefits. It was recognized, however, that appointments in the military departments were not tenure-producing. In the event University regulations are silent on the non-tenure-producing character of these appointments, the regulations ought to be amended. The committee strongly favored the regularizing of standards of appointment and appointment procedures in the military science departments.

A minority of the committee dissented in part from the above and favored adjunct or visiting appointments for the military faculty. Such appointments, it was felt, would appropriately reflect the divided allegiance of military

faculty between their military and University commitments. Their stay as University faculty is temporary, being customarily limited to three years. Their salaries are not paid by the University but by the Department of Defense. The majority of the committee, however, opposed the disenfranchisement resulting from adjunct or visiting appointments and feared that such appointments might weaken the integration of military faculty with the rest of the University.

The committee respectfully submits the above report with the suggestion that such elements of its recommendations as meet with the approval of the Faculty Council be initiated by autumn quarter 1970 and be implemented as soon thereafter as possible, but no later than autumn quarter 1972.

James L. Bever
James L. Clayton
Edwin Firmage
Steve Gunn
C. W. Smith, Jr.
Robert Wolbach
Jim Brinton
Randolph L. Dryer
Albert Fisher
Michael Mattsson
Bangs Tapscott
Milton Voigt, Chairman

ASUU OPINION POLL

Topic: ROTC
Autumn, 1969

1. Total Sample Responding:	Freshmen		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Graduate		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	270	5.60	1127	23.38	1298	26.93	1366	28.34	759	15.75	4820	100.00
Female	186	7.54	723	29.31	621	25.17	691	28.01	246	9.97	2467	100.00
Total	456	6.26	1850	25.39	1919	26.33	2057	28.23	1005	13.79	7287	100.00
2. Member of ROTC?	Yes		No		Total							
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
Male	275	5.73	4523	94.27	4798	100.00						
Female	---	---	2486	100.00	2486	100.00						
	275	3.78	7009	96.22	7284	100.00						
3. ROTC should be:	Extra Curricular		Receptive Academic Credit		Be Off Campus		No Opinion		Total			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	1327	27.58	2607	54.18	523	10.88	335	7.37	48.2	100.00	48.2	100.00
Female	643	26.28	1256	51.33	184	7.52	384	14.87	2447	100.00	2447	100.00
Total	1970	27.14	3863	53.22	707	9.74	719	9.90	7259	100.00	7259	100.00

ASUU OPINION POLL - continued.

4. ROTC should be taught by:	Civilian Personnel		Military Personnel		No Opinion		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	661	14.36	2977	64.66	966	20.98	4604	100.00
Female	181	7.66	1461	61.83	721	30.51	2363	100.00
Total	842	12.09	4438	63.70	1687	24.21	6967	100.00

5. Is ROTC in conflict with the ideals of a university?	Yes		No		No Opinion		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	968	20.01	3501	72.38	368	7.61	4837	100.00
Female	322	13.11	1780	72.48	354	14.41	2456	100.00
Total	1290	17.69	5281	72.41	722	9.90	7293	100.00

COMMENTS ON THE ASUU OPINION POLL REGARDING THE ROTC

The responses to Claude W. Grant

A total of 4,870 men and 2,486 women responded to the ASUU opinion poll. The distribution of these respondents by class level and by sex is shown under Item 1. The analysis of the four questions asked is made on the basis of sex; conceivably a similar analysis could be made on the basis of class level and also on the basis of membership vs. nonmembership in ROTC.

Item 1. As observable in Item 1, only a small percentage of the respondents are freshmen. Sophomores, juniors, and senior are approximately equally represented in the total sample. The opinionnaire was also sent to graduate students. Graduate students represent approximately 14 percent of the total sample.

Item 2. Item 2 notes that 94.26 percent of the male respondents are not members of ROTC; thus, 5.74 percent of male respondents are members of ROTC.

Item 3. Interestingly, there are only minor differences between the responses of the two sexes to the subparts of this item. Twenty-seven percent of the total sample believe that ROTC should be extra curricular. Fifty-three percent believe that ROTC should receive academic credit. Nearly 10 percent would remove ROTC from the campus and another 10 percent have no opinion.

Item 4. Regarding who should teach in the ROTC program, a higher percentage of women than men (30 percent in contrast to 20 percent) stated no opinion. About equal percentages (64 percent) believe military personnel should teach ROTC courses.

Item 5. The majority of the respondents of each sex (72.4 percent) do not believe that there is a conflict in ideals between the ROTC program and the University. However, 20 percent of the men and 13 percent of the women believe such a conflict does exist. Among women, 14.4 percent had no opinion and among men 7.6 percent had no opinion.

Summary COMMENTS ON THE ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE

The responses to the ASUU opinion poll were analysed according to the sex of the respondents.

1. In general there are only minor differences, as measured by percentages, between men and women in responses to the questions.

2. Less than six percent of the male respondents are ROTC cadets.

3. Just over one-half of the total group believe that ROTC courses should be offered for credit. Thirty-seven percent believe the program should be extra curricular or off-campus. Ten percent ventured no opinion.

4. The majority of responding students (72.4 percent) do not believe a conflict in ideals exist between ROTC and the University. Nearly 10 percent were silent on this question but 17.7 percent believe that a conflict does exist.

Question 5 and Question 7, ROTC instructors: ROTC instructors are rated as competent and as qualified as faculty by a margin.

Question 8, Rights to Participation in Other Courses: Few cadets believe they have freedom in the ROTC limited their freedom of participation in other courses. About 5 percent of Army cadets and Navy cadets believe that their freedom of participation is limited.

Question 9, ROTC at College Cost: Only a small fraction of the total group (1.4 percent) believe that ROTC does not rely on college expenses.

Question 10, College Credit for ROTC Courses: Ninety-five percent of the total group of cadets indicated that college credit should be given for ROTC courses. For Air Force cadets (10.4 percent) and Army cadets (6.13 percent)

than Navy. COMMENTS ON THE ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE
should not be glanced.

Claude W. Grant

Question 11, Reservation of Academic Freedom Related:
The following is a summary of the responses to the ROTC questionnaire. (I do not have information on the sampling procedures used nor the percentage of returns from each cadet group.)

Question 4, Course Difficulty: Cadets responded that in general ROTC courses are similar in difficulty to other courses. About 22 percent found them easier and 8 percent found them harder. Seventy percent found them similar. Among the cadet groups a higher proportion of the Army cadets found ROTC courses easier (26.54 percent) and a greater proportion of Navy cadets found them similar (78.26 percent) in difficulty to other courses.

Question 5, Academic Content: The responses to this question paralleled the responses to Question 4. A slightly higher percentage of Air Force cadets viewed their courses as more difficult with more academic content than members of the other two groups. The responses to each question were distributed similarly.

Question 6 and Question 7, ROTC Instructors: ROTC instructors are viewed as competent and as qualified as faculty as a whole.

Question 8, Limits to Participation in Other Courses: Few cadets believe that membership in the ROTC limited their freedom of participation in other courses. About 4 percent of Army cadets and Navy cadets believe that their freedom of participation is limited.

Question 9, ROTC on College Campuses: Only a small fraction of the total group (1.47 percent) believe that ROTC does not belong on college campuses.

Question 10, College Credit for ROTC Courses: Ninety-five percent of the total group of cadets indicated that college credit should be given for ROTC courses. More Air Force cadets (8.11 percent) and Army cadets (6.23 percent)

than Navy cadets (1.10 percent) believe that college credit should not be granted.

Question 11, Restriction of Academic Freedom Related to ROTC: Fourteen percent of the total group believe that academic freedom is restricted by ROTC. Navy cadets express this view the most frequently (19.57 percent) and the Air Force cadets least frequently (7.69 percent).

Question 12, Impact of ROTC Staff, Directives, Counseling, on Academic Freedom: Only half of those cadets that indicated ROTC limits their academic freedom attribute this loss to specific practices of the ROTC staff. Apparently there is a broader more pervasive influence related to the military that is experienced by some cadets as a limiting factor.

Question 13 and Question 14, Restriction on Political Activities When Out of Uniform: A sizable proportion of cadets (34 percent) believe that ROTC membership restricts their freedom to participate in political activities. This feeling is most predominant among Navy cadets (44.57 percent). Of those who feel restricted the majority believe that political involvement will result in sanctions which will show up on their military record.

Question 15, ROTC Courses in Academic Departments: Nearly one-quarter of the total group believe that ROTC courses could be taught better in academic departments; three-quarters do not.

Question 16, Continue ROTC at the U: To this question there was virtually a 100 percent affirmative response.

Summary

Responses to this questionnaire indicate that:

1. The ROTC program is not differentiated by cadets from the regular academic program in terms of instructors' competence and qualifications, nor in terms of course content.
2. With few exceptions, ROTC cadets believe that ROTC

programs belong on university campuses and courses offered within the programs should receive college credit.

3. Some cadets believe that membership in the ROTC program affects some of their freedoms.

- a. 3.64 percent feel limited in their participation in other courses.
- b. 14 percent feel that their academic freedom in general is limited.
- c. 34 percent feel that their political freedom is limited.

4. The majority of those experiencing political restriction of freedom believe that sanction might be taken against them for some political activities and that these sanctions will result in blemished records.

5. About one-quarter of the cadets responded that ROTC courses could be taught better in other departments, but three-quarters thought not.

ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions	Army		Air		Navy		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No. 4. Difficulty of ROTC courses:								
Easier. . . .	73	26.54	7	17.95	11	11.96	91	22.41
Similar . . .	184	66.91	27	69.23	72	78.26	283	69.71
Harder. . . .	18	6.55	5	12.82	9	9.78	32	7.88
Total	275	100.00	39	100.00	92	100.00	406	100.00
No. 5. Academic content of ROTC courses:								
Lower	63	22.58	6	15.38	7	7.69	76	18.58
Similar . . .	192	68.82	26	66.67	73	80.22	291	71.15
Higher. . . .	24	8.60	7	17.95	11	12.09	42	10.27
Total	279	100.00	39	100.00	91	100.00	409	100.00
No. 6. ROTC Instructions:								
Below Average. 18		6.59	2	5.13	7	8.05	27	6.77
Average . . .	124	45.42	27	69.23	71	81.61	222	55.64
Above Average. 131		47.99	10	25.64	9	10.34	150	37.59
Total	273	100.00	39	100.00	87	100.00	399	100.00
No. 7. ROTC Instructions:								
Qualified . . .	271	97.48	39	100.00	90	98.90	400	98.04
Not Qualified	7	2.52	0	---	1	1.10	8	1.96
Total	278	100.00	39	100.00	91	100.00	408	100.00
No. 8. Is there a limitation in freedom of participation in other courses related to being a cadet or midshipman?								
Yes	11	3.93	0	---	4	4.30	15	3.64
No.	269	96.07	39	100.00	89	95.70	397	96.36
Total	280	100.00	39	100.00	93	100.00	412	100.00

ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE - continued.

Questions	Army		Air		Navy		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
No. 9. Should ROTC courses be taught on college campuses?	Yes.272	98.19	38	97.44	92	100.00	402	98.53
	No.5	1.81	1	2.56	0	--	6	1.47
	Total	277	100.00	39	100.00	92	100.00	408	100.00
No. 10. Should university credit be given for ROTC courses?	Yes.256	93.77	34	91.89	90	93.90	380	94.76
	No.17	6.23	3	8.11	1	1.10	21	5.24
	Total	273	100.00	37	100.00	91	100.00	401	100.00
No. 11. Does ROTC restrict academic freedom?	Yes.36	13.00	3	7.69	18	19.57	57	13.97
	No.241	87.00	36	92.31	74	80.43	351	86.03
	Total	277	100.00	39	100.00	92	100.00	408	100.00
No. 12. Have ROTC staff orders, directives, or counseling restricted academic freedom?	Yes.19	6.93	1	2.56	6	6.45	26	6.40
	No.255	93.07	38	97.44	87	93.55	380	93.60
	Total	274	100.00	39	100.00	93	100.00	406	100.00
No. 13. Does ROTC restrict political activities out of uniform?	Yes.84	30.55	13	33.33	41	44.57	138	33.99
	No.191	69.45	26	66.67	51	55.43	268	66.01
	Total	275	100.00	39	100.00	92	100.00	406	100.00

ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE - continued.

Questions	Army		Air		Navy		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No. 14. If "yes" to #13								
what action do you expect ROTC to take?								
None	17	26.98	1	7.69	12	28.57	30	25.42
Dismissal	17	26.98	1	7.69	8	19.05	26	22.03
Cut in Rank	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---
No distinction- guished military student consideration.	8	12.70	3	23.08	1	2.38	12	10.18
Cut in Grade	5	7.94	2	15.38	0	---	7	5.93
Noted on officer's record.	13	20.64	5	38.47	8	19.05	26	22.03
Disciplinary action in unit.	3	4.76	1	7.69	13	30.95	17	14.41
Other	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---
Total	63	100.00	13	100.00	42	100.00	118	100.00
No. 15. ROTC could be better taught in other departments:								
Yes	62	22.88	10	27.03	20	22.47	92	23.17
No	209	77.12	27	72.97	69	77.53	305	76.83
Total	271	100.00	37	100.00	89	100.00	397	100.00
No. 16. Should ROTC be continued at U of U?								
Yes	274	99.28	38	100.00	91	98.91	403	99.26
No	2	.72	0	---	1	1.09	3	.74
Total	276	100.00	38	100.00	92	100.00	406	100.00

APPENDIX 4

ROTC QUESTIONNAIRE

10. Do you believe the ROTC courses should be given university credit? If No, explain.

11. Do you believe your participation in ROTC restricts your academic freedom in any way? If Yes, state how.

Major: _____
 _____ Freshman
 _____ Sophomore
 _____ Junior
 _____ Senior

12. Do you believe that any directives or counseling given to you by ROTC instructors have restricted your academic freedom? If Yes, state how. If No, explain.

Circle one answer where appropriate:

1. Of which ROTC are you a member? Army Navy Air Force
2. How many years of ROTC have you completed? 1 2 3 4
3. Why did you become a member of ROTC?
 Explain.
4. Compared to the average of all classes you have taken at the University, do you think your ROTC classes are:
 a. easier b. about the same c. more difficult?
5. Compared to the average of all classes you have taken at the University, do you think the academic content of your ROTC classes is: a. lower b. about the same c. higher?
6. Compared to all teachers you have had at the University, do you think your ROTC instructors are: a. below average b. average c. above average?
7. Do you believe your ROTC instructors are both qualified and prepared to teach their subjects? a. Yes b. No
8. Do you feel that being a cadet or midshipman limits your freedom of verbal or written participation in non-ROTC courses? a. Yes b. No Explain.
9. Do you believe ROTC courses should be taught on a college campus? a. Yes b. No

10. Do you believe that ROTC courses should be given university credit? a. Yes b. No If No, explain.

11. Do you believe your participation in the ROTC program restricts your academic freedom in any way? a. Yes b. No If Yes, state how.

12. Do you believe that any directives, orders or counseling given to you by members of the ROTC staff have restricted your academic freedom? a. Yes b. No If Yes, state specifics.

13. Are there political activities which you feel you could not engage in publicly out of uniform? a. Yes b. No Explain.

14. If the answer to No. 13 is Yes, what action would you expect the ROTC to take: None Dismissal from program Reduction to inferior cadet rank Elimination from consideration as a Distinguished Military Student Reduction of academic grade Notation on permanent officer's record Disciplinary action within the unit Other?

15. Could some of the courses presently taught by ROTC departments be better taught in other departments? a. Yes b. No If Yes, specify courses.

16. Taking all things into consideration, do you believe the ROTC programs should be continued at the University of Utah? a. Yes b. No